

COMPARING GRAMMAR TRANSLATION METHOD (GTM) AND COMMUNICATIVE LANGUAGE TEACHING (CLT) IN EFL CONTEXT: A QUALITATIVE LITERATURE REVIEW

Paulomi Rahman Nisha
University of Dhaka, Dhaka, Bangladesh

*paulomi.rahman.nisha@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

Teaching English as a foreign language (EFL) differs greatly from teaching English as a first language (L1). To ensure that teaching and learning are successful and efficient, teachers must possess a broad range of pedagogical expertise. Each method needs to be adjusted to the particular educational and environmental setting. The primary objective of this article is to provide comprehensive insights into two prominent language teaching methods, namely the Grammar Translation Method (GTM) and Communicative Language Teaching (CLT). While GTM has been historically prevalent, CLT has recently gained widespread popularity. This paper focuses on the understanding of educational practitioners, particularly in the domain of English Language Teaching (ELT) setting, by conducting a comprehensive comparison of GTM and CLT thoroughly, focusing on teaching techniques, characteristics of both teaching methods, and the way the instructor addresses students' mistakes. Although CLT is recognized as the more realistic and advantageous method in contemporary contexts, it is still acknowledged that GTM possesses certain positive attributes. Additionally, since every country has its own unique set of circumstances, social norms, and background, the teacher must be aware of the most suitable teaching-learning method.

Keywords: Communicative Language Teaching, EFL Context, Grammar Translation Method

INTRODUCTION

The use of the appropriate approach is crucial when teaching English as a Foreign Language (EFL). While the Grammar Translation Method (GTM) is very traditional, Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) is one of the newest approaches that EFL teachers apply around the world. Both of these methods are highly useful, but there are clear distinctions between them in terms of approach and theoretical background. According to Wardhaugh (1972), language is a system of arbitrary symbols used for human communication. According to Richards & Rodgers (2001) "An approach or method refers to a theoretically consistent set of teaching procedures that define best practices in language teaching" (p. 15). Delving into the foundations of language teaching, Henry Sweet (1899) stated that a scientific study of psychology and linguistic analysis should serve as a base for good methodological principles.

Every language instructor has a different story of how they learned languages. During their own "apprenticeship of observation," instructors were trained in this manner (Lortie 1975). Teachers have the option to instruct differently from how they were instructed if they are clear about their views. (Clarke, 2003). It is well known that educators bring to teacher preparation experiences certain notions about the teaching and learning process derived from their years as learners (Lortie 1975). Moreover, teachers have options for how they at present consider, and carry out when they use different ways. It is not a given that they will decide to change their existing procedure. If they are able and choose to, they will have the knowledge and resources necessary to accomplish so.

This qualitative article is designed to study the comparison between GTM and CLT in order to discuss these topics in greater detail. This paper serves as crucial for teachers to understand how both methods differ from each other and what approach works best for their students in the EFL context. For additional information regarding both methods, a thorough analysis of the differences between GTM and CLT is given in the elaboration.

GRAMMAR TRANSLATION METHOD (GTM)

Grammar Translation Method (GTM), is the term for the most recognized and centuries-old method. This method has a long history of accomplishment in the teaching of English. Grammar Translation Method (GTM) has gone by several names, language instructors have been using it for a long time. By its mere name, this method—also called the translation method—indicates that teaching the target language involves translating it into the native languages. This method is based on the idea that translation is the most effective way to teach and learn a foreign language.

Originally, it was initially recognized and identified as the Prussian Method in the United States (Kelly 1969). It was formerly known as the "Classical Method" since it was primarily applied to the teaching of two classical languages. According to Brown (1994) Latin and Greek, among various ancient languages, were taught using classical methods. This method was employed to assist students in reading and appreciating literature written in Foreign Languages (FL) earlier in the 20th century.

Richards and Rodgers (2002) define GTM as, "A method of foreign or second language teaching which makes use of translation and grammar study as the main teaching and learning activities" (p. 231). The underlying premise is that all languages share a basic grammar and that the structure of the English language can be best learned by comparing the grammar of the native language and the Target Language (TL), neither of which is easier to understand and acquire. In the classroom, a native language tends to be used rather than the Target Language (TL). The student's native language is used as the educational medium in this method. It is employed to compare students' native language with the target language and explain new items. In this method, accuracy is prioritized over fluency.

It is necessary to demonstrate the benefits of GTM to explore it more effectively. By translating each English phrase or word into the student's native language, the teacher can instantly help the students grasp it and save time. It also aids the teacher in determining whether or not the students have absorbed the foreign language. This approach is simple because it moves from the known to the unknown, which makes teaching and learning easier.

As a result, it solidifies the memory connection between the foreign symbols and the original language. This approach is highly dependable for providing students with comprehension practice in reading. GTM prioritizes written language over spoken language and pays very little attention to spoken language. The entire process involved shifting from analysis and explanation to creating questions and answers.

A crucial component of teaching languages is dictation. With this method, spoken words gradually transition from written forms. For example, learning English words starts with the letters of the alphabet. The spellings took precedence over the sound. Students learned its spelling before learning the spoken form or how to pronounce a word. As a result, the FL English learner relies on spelling to determine how to pronounce words.

COMMUNICATIVE LANGUAGE TEACHING (CLT)

A number of movements in the US and Europe in the 1970s and early 1980s contributed to the rise in popularity of Communicative Language Teaching (CLT). Situational Language Teaching (SLT) dominated the English Language Teaching (ELT) landscape in Britain until the late 1960s. Upon its inception in the 1970s, Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) was largely seen as the last solution to the communication shortcomings of earlier paradigms and the demands of an increasingly interconnected world. Content-based instruction, also known as Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL), became increasingly popular in the United States for English language learners as well as in language education abroad, especially in Europe as well.

In Communicative Language Learning (CLL) which is closer to the CLT approach, students are expected to interact more with one another than with the teacher, there is often no text, and grammar standards are not presented. CLT It is not the subject of a single text, a single model that is regarded as authoritative by all. It generally makes use of resources and techniques that are suitable for the particular learning environment. Linguists realized that communicative competence, not only structural mastery, should be the main emphasis of language instruction. The start of the communicative approach can be seen in Chomsky's work from the 1960s when he developed the concepts of "performance" and "competence" in opposition to the dominant Audio-Lingual method and its tenets. There was a shift in the field in the late 1970s and early 1980s from a linguistic structure-centered approach to a Communicative Approach (Widdowson, 1990; Savignon, 1997).

Interaction is emphasized as the primary means to achieve the objective of language acquisition in the CLT approach to teaching second and foreign languages. Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) attempts to make communicative competence the goal of language instruction by utilizing the theoretical framework of the Communicative Approach (Larsen-Freeman & Anderson, 2011). The communicative approach is predicated on the notion that effective language acquisition requires the ability to transmit meaningful content. Learners will be able to use the language since they will be using their natural language acquisition mechanisms when engaging in authentic communication. Its objective is to utilize real-world scenarios that demand communication. CLT does not follow a single theory or approach. Its perspectives on education come from various fields, including Second Language Acquisition (SLA), educational psychology, and cognitive science. Thus, setting up the classroom as a

place for communication and communicative activities is the main responsibility of the CLT instructor.

COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS

This study initiates an in-depth comparative analysis of the Grammar Translation Method (GTM) and Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) within the English as a Foreign Language (EFL) context, delving into their distinctive methodologies and assessing their effectiveness in language instruction. Based on factors such as the medium of instruction, main-focused language skills, the teaching and learning process, motivation, and response to mistakes, a detailed comparative analysis will be presented below.

Medium of Instruction

Whereas CLT places more of an emphasis on communication and allows students to experiment with the language so they can learn it naturally, GTM lessons are taught mostly in the students' native language with little to no active usage of the target language. Since L1 is used in GTM, to interpret the Target Language(TL), native language plays a crucial role in the process. Learners will apply to their native language all that they have learned about the target language (Harmer, 2007). Additionally, both teachers and students attempt to comprehend grammar in their native languages while studying it. The majority of the teaching and learning processes are carried out in the native language, which the teacher also uses to investigate the grammar of the target language. In CLT the target language is used throughout the entire teaching and learning process. (Brown, 2007). Therefore, the aim of this approach is to acquaint the students with the target language as well, enabling them to communicate effectively and meaningfully.

Main-Focused Language Skills

For learners to be proficient in language, they must master four abilities. They are speaking, writing, listening, and reading. According to (Harmer, 2007) listening and reading are receptive skills, and speaking and writing are productive skills. Reading and writing are the two abilities that are prioritized in the GTM method. This implies that students only learn one skill—that of obtaining information—and one skill—that of producing and delivering information. As a result, this method is less suitable for improving students' language proficiency, particularly when learning a foreign language. In contrast, the CLT starts the teaching and learning process by teaching the students the four skills. The students are typically split up into small groups, and it is via these groups and classes that they learn the four talents. Since students utilize the language in class and in their daily lives, even though they make a lot of mistakes, they achieve perfect competence and performance using this method. Overall, compared to the GTM approaches, the teacher teaches skills to the students more thoroughly in the CLT method.

The Types/Modes of Interaction

GTM focuses mostly on teacher-to-student interaction. The majority of the teaching-learning process originates with the instructor (Brown, 2007; Harmer, 2007). With this method, the teacher serves as the primary resource for both instruction and learning, providing a one-way demonstration of the subject matter. If any of the students are unclear about the meaning of words or the structure of a sentence, they simply ask the teacher the question. To help students understand the lesson, the teacher will accomplish this by providing the solution right away. In contrast, the teacher and students actively interact when using the CLT approach. To achieve the purpose of teaching and learning, the teacher serves as a mentor. There is active communication between the teacher and the students as well as between the students and the teacher in CLT (Thompson, 1996; Brown, 2007; Hiep, 2005). Students rarely engage with one another during the teaching and learning process when employing the GTM method.

As a result, students never discuss the subject with one another and only acquire information from the teacher. On the other hand, the CLT method places a strong emphasis on student engagement (Hiep, 2005). To address the issue and respond to the teacher's inquiry, students may interact. Breen and Candlin's (1980) emphasize negotiation in CLT, "The role of learner as negotiator – between the self, the learning process, and the object of learning" (p. 110). CLT approach is highly beneficial to the learning process because it allows the instructor to act as a co-communicator with the learners, increasing the effectiveness and efficiency of the teaching and learning process to achieve its objectives, marks (Prabhu 1987).

Teaching and Learning Process

Grammar Translation Method (GTM) mainly involves the student in vocabulary memorization, translation of foreign literary and scholarly texts, and translation into the native language. Deductive application of grammatical rules is mostly used in the GTM method. Hedge and Thornbury (2001) state that GTM not only gives language learners access to input but also make grammatical aspects easier to understand, which is particularly beneficial for EFL learners. Wilkins (1976) remarks that CLT syllabuses emphasize notions and functions over grammatical structures. According to Littlewood (1981), one of the distinguishing features of communicative language teaching is its systematic focus on both the functional and structural aspects of language.

Classroom Activities

Textbooks for GTM mostly comprised definitions of terms and lists of vocabulary. Most of the time, the only activities the students do is translations. GTM would provide little oral competency, and students were frequently expected to travel overseas and immerse themselves to acquire fluency. In contrast, CLT emphasizes the importance of learner-centered language instruction and provides chances for students to utilize language communicatively. Littlewood (1981); Finocchiaro and Brumfit (1983) in their Guidelines for classroom practice propose that, in the course of an activity, the teacher observes, motivates,

and refrains from providing answers to gaps in vocabulary, grammar, and strategy. Instead, these gaps are recorded for subsequent discussion and communicative exercises.

CLT focused on the kinds of task-work, group work, and information-gap activities that could serve as a basis for a communicative approach. Addressing the communication needs of the learners and the classroom activities are the main priorities. According to Richards and Rodgers (2001), “CLT, promotes learning through communication in pairs or small groups” (p. 174). Johnson and Johnson (1998) identify that students must be able to create and understand authentic messages—that is, ones with real meanings. For this reason, information transfer and sharing are emphasized in CLT.

Motivation

While comparing the CLT and GTM methods, it can be said that whereas GTM is monotonous and involves a one-way transmission, CLT is more communicative and cooperative than GTM in terms of improving students' language skills. The primary source of the teaching and learning process is the teacher. According to Brown (1994), “the students have little motivation to go beyond grammar analogies, translations, and rote exercises” in GTM. (p. 53). The students might feel demotivated. On the other hand, the CLT uses a variety of teaching strategies to engage students in the class and make them feel at ease and pleased. Moreover, CLT is a modern approach that views the teacher and the students as collaborators in the learning process. As a result of having the chance to share their ideas, interests, and feelings, students feel at ease with the teacher. In addition to being the primary source, the instructor can also serve as a co-communicator and facilitator for the students. Students also attentively study because, in a CLT classroom, the teacher motivates students to achieve the objectives (Brown, 2007).

Response to Mistakes

The teacher will correct the students' mistakes directly in GTM. Although the students are directly aware of their errors, this method may not be beneficial in the long run because it reduces their confidence in their ability to speak in class. Accuracy is seen as essential in the GTM method (Harmer, 2007). After all, students fear making mistakes. Moreover, the students exhibit great caution in their performance and possess the ability to evaluate language, but they lack the confidence and skill to use the language effectively, especially in communicative situations.

It is important that teachers respect the ways in which they do these tasks and anticipate that students will manage the results of their choices. (Szabo & Scharle, 2000). The teacher will assist students in finding and correcting their mistakes. (Brown, 2007). In contrast, CLT is student-centered since it allows the teacher to accept mistakes made by the students. Positively, students are confident and do not hesitate to use the language in everyday situations. They also feel at ease and content when using it. In summary, the GTM method responds to students directly, while the CLT method responds indirectly. Each method has benefits and drawbacks of its own.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

The comparative analysis between the Grammar Translation Method (GTM) and Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) has unveiled significant differences in instructional approaches. Both of the methods differ greatly. From the comparative analyses, the major differences between GTM and CLT are evident in the following:

Table 1. Major Differences Between GTM & CLT

Criteria	GTM (Classical /Traditional)	CLT (Latest/ Modern)
Medium of Instruction	Mostly Native Language or First Language (L1) is used as a medium of Instruction.	Target Language (TL) or Foreign Language (FL) is used as a medium of instruction.
Learning Approach	The vocabulary of foreign literature is memorized.	The students learn the Target Language (TL) mostly through situational and real-world content.
Role of the Teacher	The teacher takes on an authoritative role.	The teacher functions as a facilitator.
Role of Students	Students are expected to translate and analyze the text of a foreign language.	Students are expected to use the language in the real world.
Pronunciation	Little or no attention is given to pronunciation.	Pronunciation is often integrated and receives more attention.
Goal of Learning	Focus on presenting deductive grammar explanations before generating sentences.	Focus on encouraging students to actively engage and interact in the target language.
Skills Focused	Places emphasis on reading and writing skills.	Prioritizes all four language skills.
Interaction	The teacher mostly interacts with the students (T-Ss) in a traditional lecture-based classroom.	The students engage in active communication (S-S/ Ss-Ss), forming pairs, and small groups interacting with the entire class.
Error Correction	The teacher provides direct correction of student errors.	The teacher allows errors and guides students in revising them.

It is evident that while interactive communication activities were prioritized in CLT, reading and writing were the first steps in the English language learning process in GTM. The use of translation as a teaching tool for First Language (L1) is eliminated from educational settings that teach foreign languages. The findings of this study underscore the pronounced differences between these two methods. It is evident in the findings that GTM relies on memorization, whereas CLT prioritizes real-world content. The findings of this study also highlight that GTM features an authoritative teacher role, with students translating and analyzing while CLT emphasizes a facilitator role, expecting students to use the language authentically. This choice significantly influences learner interaction.

Moreover, GTM lacks emphasis on pronunciation and focuses on reading and writing. CLT integrates pronunciation and prioritizes all language skills. It is also apparent that GTM

involves limited interaction and direct error correction. CLT encourages student interaction, allowing for natural language acquisition. For this reason, information transfer and sharing are emphasized in CLT activities, which are focused on the kinds of task-work, group work, and information-gap activities that could serve as a basis for a communicative approach. The systematic focus on both functional and structural aspects in CLT explains the comprehensive skill development. Individual interpretation and variance are allowed far more than most approaches allow.

Since CLT first emerged, British language instruction was prepared for a paradigm change. People who were looking for a more humane approach to teaching—one that prioritized interactive communication processes—found CLT appealing. However, the foundation of CLT is the notion that effective language learning requires the ability to convey genuine meaning. Learners will be able to use the language since they will be using their natural language acquisition mechanisms when engaging in authentic communication. By navigating through these findings, a comprehensive understanding emerges—highlighting the need for a dynamic and adaptable method that aligns with the goals of language learners. The integration of different theories solidifies the implications of adopting the accurate method in contemporary language teaching contexts.

It is noteworthy that both the Grammar Translation Method (GTM) and Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) are well-acknowledged by teachers. Despite the perceived outdated nature of GTM when compared to the more contemporary CLT method, it persists in some educational settings. The coexistence of these methods suggests that each has its relevance within specific national contexts, shaped by unique conditions, contexts, and social cultures. Educators, therefore, must exercise awareness and discretion in selecting the most effective teaching strategies tailored to the needs of their students.

CONCLUSION

Teaching foreign or second languages does not have a single, definitive optimum method. A successful educator will not stick to just one method. A technique that works well with one class one day may not work well with the same class the next. There is unlikely to be any trouble if we recognize students and design our program to meet the demands of the class. Overall, teachers are conversant with both the GTM and CLT methods.

Even though GTM is an outdated method when compared to the CLT method, it is still used in some nations. Given that every country has a unique set of conditions, contexts, and social cultures, educators must be aware of the best teaching strategies for their students. While this study contributes valuable insights into the ongoing discourse on language teaching methods, it is imperative to acknowledge its limitations. The findings are based on a specific set of conditions and contexts, and the results should be approached with caution.

For further advanced understanding of language instruction, future research endeavors should explore diverse educational environments and consider additional factors influencing the choice and effectiveness of language teaching methods. This could include investigating the impact of cultural nuances, classroom dynamics, and varying proficiency levels of students. Such endeavors will contribute to the continual evolution of effective language-teaching strategies and enhance the body of scientific knowledge in the field.

REFERENCES

- Breen, M. Candlin, C. N. (1980). The essentials of a communicative curriculum in language teaching. Applied Linguistics.
- Brown, H. D. (1994). Principles of Language Learning and Teaching. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall Regents.
- Brown, H. D. (2007). Teaching by Principle; An Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy. Third Edition. New York: Pearson Longman.
- Finocchiaro, M., and C. Brumfit. (1983). The Functional-Notional Approach: From Theory to Practice. New York: Oxford University Press.
- K. Johnson and H. Johnson. (1998). Encyclopedic Dictionary of Applied Linguistics. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.
- Kelly, L. (1969). 25 Centuries of Language Teaching. Rowley, Mass: Newbury House.
- Harmer, J. (2007). The Practice of English Language Teaching. Fourth Edition. Cambridge: Pearson Longman.
- Hedge, T. (2000). Teaching and Learning in the Language Classroom. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Larsen-Freeman, D. and Anderson, M. (2011). Techniques & Principles in Language Teaching. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Littlewood, W. (1981). Communicative Language Teaching. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lortie, D. (1975). Schoolteacher: A Sociological Study. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Prabhu, N.S. (1987). Second Language Pedagogy. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Richards, J., and Rodgers, T. (1986). Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Richards, J. C., and Schmidt, R. (2002). Longman Dictionary of Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics. Pearson Education Limited.
- Scharle, Agota & Anita Szabo (2000), A Guide to Developing Learner Responsibility, Cambridge University Press.
- Sweet, H. (1899). The Practical Study of Languages. Reprinted London: Oxford University Press.
- Thornbury, S. (2003). How to Teach Grammar. Beijing: World Affairs Press.
- Wardhaugh, R. (1972). Introduction to Linguistics. McGraw-Hill Book Company.
- Wilkins, D. A. (1976). Notional Syllabuses. Oxford: Oxford University Press.